

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 ISRAEL MALDONADO RAMIREZ,

10 Case No. 1:22-cv-01642-ADA-SAB (PC)

11 Plaintiff,

12 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
13 TO REMOVE MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
14 BOONE

15 v.  
16 DIRECTOR ALL HOSPITAL, et al.,

17 (ECF Nos. 17, 18, 19)

18 Defendants.

19 Plaintiff Israel Maldonado Ramirez is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil  
20 rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

21 Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to recuse the undersigned Magistrate  
22 Judge, filed April 12, 2023. The Court finds an opposition by Defendants to be unnecessary.

23 Federal law allows a judge to recuse from a matter based on a question of partiality:

24 Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any  
25 proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned. He shall also  
26 disqualify himself ... [w]here he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or  
27 personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the proceeding....

28 U.S.C. 455(a), (b)(1).

29 A party may seek recusal of a judge based on bias or prejudice:

30 Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and  
31 sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or  
32 prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no

1 further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding ... The affidavit  
2 shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists[.]

3 28 U.S.C. § 144.

4 Relief under Section 144 is conditioned upon the filing of a timely and legally sufficient  
5 affidavit. A judge who finds the affidavit legally sufficient must proceed no further under Section  
6 144 and must assign a different judge to hear the matter. See 28 U.S.C. § 144; United States v.  
7 Sibla, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980). Nevertheless, where the affidavit lacks sufficiency, the  
8 judge at whom the motion is directed can determine the matter and deny recusal. See United  
9 States v. Scholl, 166 F.3d 964, 977 (9th Cir. 1999) (citing Toth v. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 862  
10 F.2d 1381, 1388 (9th Cir. 1988) (holding that only after determining the legal sufficiency of  
11 a Section 144 affidavit is a judge obligated to reassign decision on merits to another  
12 judge)); United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency, 54 F.3d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1995) (if the  
13 affidavit is legally insufficient, then recusal can be denied).

14 The standard for legal sufficiency under Sections 144 and 455 is “‘whether a reasonable  
15 person with knowledge of all the facts would conclude that the judge’s impartiality might  
16 reasonably be questioned.’” Mayes v. Leipziger, 729 F.2d 605, 607 (9th Cir.  
17 1984) (quoting United States v. Nelson, 718 F.2d 315, 321 (9th Cir. 1983)); United States v.  
18 Studley, 783 F.2d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 1986). To provide adequate grounds for recusal, the prejudice  
19 must result from an extrajudicial source. Sibla, 624 F.2d 864, 869. A judge’s previous adverse  
20 rulings alone are not sufficient for recusal. Nelson, 718 F.2d at 321.

21 Here, Plaintiff contends that the assigned Magistrate Judge should be removed “because  
22 he is no good with the cause of affi[rming the case order to with a lawsuit.” (ECF No. 18.)  
23 Plaintiff’s motion for recusal in this case is substantively insufficient, as it alleges bias, prejudice  
24 and impartiality based on the undersigned’s rulings in this action. Plaintiff’s motion for  
25 recusal fails to allege facts to support a contention that the undersigned has exhibited bias or  
26 prejudice directed towards Plaintiff from an extrajudicial source. Sibla, 624 F.2d at 868. Thus,  
27 Plaintiff does not provide a basis for recusal and the motion must be denied. See Liteky v. United  
28

1 States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (“[J]udicial rulings alone almost never constitute a valid basis  
2 for a bias or partiality motion.”); *id.* (“In and of themselves ... [judicial rulings] cannot possibly  
3 show reliance upon an extrajudicial source; and can only in the rarest circumstances evidence the  
4 degree of favoritism or antagonism required ... when no extrajudicial source is  
5 involved.”) Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for recusal (ECF Nos. 17, 18, 19) is denied.  
6

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: April 14, 2023



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28